

HD
1751
A572

Land policy REVIEW

Vol. I

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER 1938

No. 3

Water For The West

The Water Facilities Program Gets Under Way

by F. R. KENNEY

THE need for conserving and utilizing rainfall in the arid and semi-arid West has long been recognized, and various agencies have attacked the problem in their own ways. But not until passage of the Water Facilities Act of 1937 did a comprehensive program to aid the farmer and rancher through small water developments on his own land come into being. Now, with an appropriation of \$500,000 from Congress (the first under this act), and an allotment of \$5,000,000 by the Farm Security Administration for the rehabilitation of needy farmers through the provision of necessary water facilities, the initial drive is being launched to promote a better use of land by means of small water developments.

Specifically, the program will operate in 17 States—all the Northern and Southern Great Plains, and the States to the west of them. As was noted in a memorandum sent to the Secretary by several bureau heads, "The largest initial allocation for use in any State will, of course, meet

only a fraction of the total need in even the least acutely affected State." Yet it is the Department's hope that the installation of these water facilities will, in most instances, prove an effective demonstration of better land and water use and thus carry an influence greater than the actual size of the projects. In any case, a sound beginning will have been made; and upon that, future programs can build.

A Coordinated Program

In its act of authorization, Congress made quite clear that it did not wish another agency to be called into being to administer this new program, but that its work should be handled by existing bureaus within the Department. Moreover, it was felt that the provision of water facilities in the West would naturally cut across the work of several bureaus already in the field. Accordingly, three agencies have been designated to cooperate with the Office of Land Use Coordination in carrying forward the program: the Soil Conservation Service, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the Farm Security Administration. Knitting together these agencies is a Water Facilities Board, composed of one member from the SCS, the BAE, and the FSA, with a fourth member as chairman, appointed by the Coordinator of Land Use Planning.

"Water facilities" is a term which includes ponds, reservoirs, diversion dams, wells, pumps and windmills, springs, stock-water tanks, and various auxiliary methods of small-scale irrigation. On no one project may more than \$50,000 be spent, and for any facility costing more than \$2,000, specific approval must be had from the Water Facilities Board. Thus, in no case will the program touch upon the type of development carried out by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Though the Secretary has been given authority to lease or purchase lands to carry out this program, it is unlikely that any considerable amount of land on which to install these water facilities will be acquired by the Department this year. Ordinarily, the program will help farmers or groups of farmers construct facilities on private land.

Land and Water Use

Recognizing the basic connection between land and water utilization, Congress stipulated in the Water Facilities Act that the facilities should be so located as to promote the proper use of land resources. In no case, the act states, should these improvements be placed where they will encourage the unsound use of land, particularly that which is submarginal for cultivation. Accordingly, applications from farmers this year will be considered only in areas for which comprehensive land and water use plans have been prepared by the BAE and approved by the Water Facilities Board. These area plans indicate the types of improvements and adjustments that will encourage a better use of the land, and place a limit upon developments in order to prevent the exhaustion of water resources.

OCT 14 '38
Farm Management Plans

Farmers cooperating in the program will be required to repay as much as they can of the cost of installing water facilities. Both to protect the Government's financial interest and to insure that the long-term objective of good land use will be achieved, farmers, in order to qualify for help, must agree to carry out farm plans drawn up in consultation with representatives of the Department. These management plans will provide for the adoption of good land use practices, the production of adequate food for family and livestock, and the cultivation of those cash crops that will best enable the farmer to repay his obligations and meet operating expenses.



The Water Facilities Program will expand small-scale irrigation, guard against exhaustion of water supplies.—(FSA photo)

It is expected that the majority of farmers participating in the program will find their incomes sufficiently increased as a consequence of the new water facilities to be able to repay the full cost of the improvements over a period of 20 years or less, at 3 percent interest. For some families who are in dire circumstances, and for whom the water facilities are the key to rehabilitation, adjustments in the repayment plan will be made.

While the adoption of an ability-to-pay principle may result in one farmer paying more for a similar water facility than his indigent neighbor, the Department also recognized that not all farm families on relief can be expected to repay the full amount expended, and that if the added facility gets them off relief rolls a public saving has been made great enough to justify the cost of a facility even half repaid.

Aid to Cooperative Groups

Though facilities will be constructed on privately-owned land, the program will not necessarily be confined to dealing with individual land owners. Arrangements may also be made with cooperative associations, mutual water companies, irrigation districts, soil conservation districts, and similar groups interested in developing the water resources of an improved area. Also, facilities may be built for tenants—if they first obtain a sufficiently stable tenure from their landlords so that their opportunity to repay is reasonably assured.

Two factors, of course, will cut down the size of the principal to be repaid. One is that only the actual cost of the facilities themselves need be covered—not the administrative expenses of the program. The second is that the farmer himself may contribute as much as he can through his own labor and the use of his own teams and equipment. In fact, if the facilities he wishes are small enough and simple enough in construction, he may build them himself.

Three Agencies at Work

The particular duties of the three cooperating agencies in prosecuting the program may be briefly outlined. General responsibility and leadership for the operations phase of the program, especially in receiving applications and in constructing and installing water facilities, has been assigned to the Soil Conservation Service. Assisted by the Farm Security Administration, the SCS is to take the initiative in preparing individual farm plans and in determining the contribution of labor, equipment, and materials which the farmer shall make to the construction of his facilities. In the field, the SCS makes the contacts for the program with the general public and supervises all arrangements with State and local agencies in an operations program.

The Farm Security Administration is to have charge of the financing of farmers, and drawing up the repayment schedules; additionally, it will

help the SCS in making up farm plans, and in guiding the farmer in carrying them out.

The responsibility of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is to prepare area plans for specific regions selected by the Water Facilities Board. These plans indicate the relative needs of various areas and sub-areas for water facilities, the number of farm families that can be thus benefited, the types of facilities needed for better land use, the estimated total costs of installation and maintenance, the kind of farming and land use which an adjustment program should encourage in certain areas, the population which these areas can be expected to carry, and similar information essential both to sound individual and sound regional land and water use planning.

Water Facilities Board

While not in itself responsible for the planning or construction of projects, the Water Facilities Board will afford a vehicle for the close cooperation of the several agencies concerned, and the integration with one another of their respective activities. The Board will recommend allotments of funds to the cooperating agencies and draw up annual budget estimates for the whole program. It will decide where area plans are to be made, approve them when prepared, and designate the particular projects to be begun. Moreover, it will keep the work of the program under constant review, ready to recommend changes in policy or procedure as the occasion requires. And perhaps as important as any of its duties, the Board will arrange for cooperation with other correlative agencies both in and out of the Department of Agriculture—such as the AAA, the Biological Survey, the Regional Coordinators, the Bureau of Reclamation, and Division of Grazing, the WPA, the Water Resources Committee, the State Planning Boards, and other such organizations.

Although some of the types of work undertaken by these other agencies may appear to parallel in part the work of the water facilities program, there is little inherent reason for either duplication or conflict. In its deliberate effort to promote better land use and to rehabilitate needy farm families in place through the development of water facilities, this program fills an entirely distinct need.



★ Encouragement of the free movement of workers from agricultural areas of limited opportunity is proposed by the report of the committee on population problems to the National Resources Committee in its summary of its recently concluded study. Governmental purchase of land unsuited to agriculture is specified by the committee as a major means of fostering such freedom of movement.

The Human Aspects of Land-Use Planning

By CARL C. TAYLOR

THERE is probably no such thing as a perfect land-use adjustment. This is due not primarily to the incapacity of the physical and economic analyst and planner to determine what the highest use of the land could be, but to the fact that land-use adjustment projects and programs accept as their guiding criterion the welfare of human beings, and the welfare of human beings not only involves factors other than perfect adjustments to land, but is never composed of a single group of fixed and invariable elements. The love for a certain farm, locality, or community, the pleasure that comes with doing accustomed and habitual things, and the pain that comes with making too drastic changes, together with certain esthetic or semiesthetic pleasures related to scenery or recreational activities, and a desire for a degree of independence and even isolation, are all factors which go to make up the complex of life's satisfactions, and thus the welfare of the people. In other words, it is possible, and indeed probable, that a given family or whole group of families may be living in what to them is a very well adjusted situation, which does not at all meet the criteria of efficient land use.

It is unfair to labor this point, but it is unwise to disregard it. To say the least, those of us who accept without equivocation the fact that "land use is definitely a problem of human lives and human welfare" must understand human life and human welfare in considerable detail before we presume to plan land-adjustment projects and programs in terms of these social objectives.

It is the purpose of this article to be as simple and explicit as possible in discussing the social and psychological factors involved in land-use adjustment, but this is not an easy task; first, because it is not as easy to analyze these factors as to analyze the physical and economic situation, and, second, because the area of knowledge by which these factors may be understood has been explored by few.

The Dangers of Classification

Further, it is much easier to list the social results than the social causes of land maladjustment. It may, for instance, be perfectly obvious that poverty, low material standards of living, and even shiftlessness are prevalent in bad-land areas. It may be altogether too simple, however, to assume that they result solely from land-use maladjustments. This is another way of saying that the ease with which

social results can be listed is partly due to incomplete or inadequate analysis. And that listing may also be open to the criticism that the results cited are assumed by the investigator to constitute social maladjustments, which the people being studied may not consider maladjustments at all.

In analyzing social causes of land-use maladjustment, equal fallacies can easily develop. As a matter of fact, they are already quite prevalent. Expressions like, "such people are simply ne'er do wells," or "you can't do anything with that kind of people," or "the land is in maladjustment because of the kind of people who live on it," are gross assumptions concerning the human causes of land maladjustment. They overlook two quite important considerations: First, that such beliefs or convictions are in no way based on an analysis of why the people have the characteristics they have or just what these characteristics are; and, second, that even though the habits, practices, and attitudes of the people are not effective in accomplishing conservation and right uses of land, they may be quite effective in developing a stable and satisfactory home and community life. We need analyses which will furnish these unknown answers. After all, the habits, practices, attitudes, standards of living, and institutions of the people in these areas have a natural history. They are resident, and one might say indigenous, facts which constitute a part of the situation being dealt with.

Standards—and What They Don't Mean

No one will deny that there is wastage or destruction of the land, that erosion deposits silt in streams and sometimes on valuable land, and that rapid run-off of water causes floods, nor that these prove that land use maladjustment has definite human results in other areas and for future generations. All these comprise ample justification for insisting upon changed land uses in many areas. It is not so obvious, or even justifiable, to assume that because the standards of living and the social practices of the people now in the area do not measure up to criteria established in other places, obvious social maladjustment exists in the lives of these people. In other words, a land-use adjustment program that accepts as its prime objective human or social adjustments must have a practical understanding, if not a definite blueprint, of what an acceptable social adjustment in an area would be.

To go forward without such an understanding is to run the risk of creating some social maladjustments while correcting others. It would be easy to imagine such situations. One would be that of isolated mountain families who had for generations carried on self-sufficient farming. Row tillage of the soil never constituted more than one-half of their economic program. At first they were hunters



Mountain handcraft—one aspect of a culture that land planners must recognize. (FSA photo)

and fishermen, gatherers of herbs and roots, and while living on low material standards of living, were highly independent, self-directing individualists. They may have later shifted partly to lumbering and coal mining and may have developed handicrafts, but still continued to farm very little, and in many instances without machines and sometimes even without horsepower. However, they have developed their own type of religious institution and have created a large body of folk culture, in terms of music, dances, and sports; they have their own criteria not only for measuring what constitutes a man but also of what constitutes good and evil.

Now, in many instances, while the lack of modern conveniences and monetary income may be a great drawback, no one has a prescription by which such a family can be transformed into successful flatland, commercial farmers; much less has anyone a prescription by which he can guarantee to convert these families into finer citizens or compensate them for a folk culture which will almost certainly be lost once they are moved out of their old habitat.

Readjustment, Not Uprootings

It is more than likely that a real social analysis of the people living in so-called bad land areas will contribute directly to the initiation of

a number of programs not related to removal or resettlement of any great number of families, but definitely related to developing the maximum human carrying capacity of the areas in which these families now reside. A program for an area with relatively good soil but steep topography, interspersed with small creek valleys, is fairly easy to visualize. There are many such areas in the mountain regions of the eastern part of the country. The program will probably require reforestation of the steepest lands, terraced grass culture for lands not susceptible to row culture, and terracing and strip farming for all other than the bottom lands.

Merely to recite such a prescription presents nothing new by way of a program, but to initiate such a program which assumes that the so-called self-sufficient farming which the people of the area have always practiced can be made twice as efficient as it has been, and thus the material standard of living of the people be definitely raised without destroying their love for a particular habitat, disrupting their community life, and changing their whole cultural pattern, does present a new approach to a difficult problem. Such a program would not only make it unnecessary for a great many families to relocate, but would definitely preserve the culture of the region, which the people cherish highly.

The illustration just given is not presumed to be a prescription for the solution of overpopulated land areas, of which there are a number in the United States. It is given simply to illustrate the strong probability that a thoroughgoing analysis and real appreciation of the social structure and content of such an area will sharply change the program of adjustment prescribed for that area.

Cultural Considerations in the Great Plains

An illustration of how social considerations may and should contribute to land-use adjustment programs in sparsely populated areas can be cited from the High Plains area of the Nation. Here the size of holdings required for economic support of families who practice right land uses is so large as to make the establishment and maintenance of public and semipublic institutions very difficult. If the population is too small or too widely scattered, hospitals, libraries, and even schools cannot be maintained, or if maintained can be supported only at tremendous costs. If, therefore, criteria of social welfare are to be the objectives of land-use adjustment, the size of holdings, even though they reduce the possible economic income, may need to be modified in order to guarantee the maintenance of necessary social institutions.

Here again, the illustration is not given as a prescription which dictates that land planning shall start with the assumption that par standard schools, churches, libraries, and hospitals are possible everywhere or that the known best use of the land must be abandoned. It is given

merely to point out that when the social analysis is made, and the social criteria are given due consideration, the facts involved will almost certainly serve to alter any land use program which is projected without due consideration of the criteria of public welfare.

The Criteria of Land Planning

The essence of the viewpoint I am attempting to present is that land planning in terms of human welfare goes wrong when it takes as its sole criterion either land maladjustment or what is thought by the planner to be social maladjustment. If it is concerned solely with the correct use of the land from a physical or even an economic viewpoint, the actual carrying out of the program will, in a great many cases, disturb social arrangements, with no clear or feasible plan by which it can offer acceptable arrangements. If, on the other hand, it takes its cue solely from the standpoint of what the planner thinks to be social maladjustments, it will almost certainly overemphasize human distress, low material standards of living, and lack of cultural opportunities as measured by standards which have never prevailed and are not even known in the area.

In the first instance, the planner can be legitimately indicted for assuming that all human adjustments depend upon the correct use of the land, and that all human maladjustments can be eliminated simply by eliminating incorrect uses of the land. In the second instance, he can be indicted for assuming that all people everywhere should have and do desire standards of living which the planner prescribes. Neither of these viewpoints is acceptable from the standpoint of sound sociology or from the standpoint of accomplishing practical adjustments.

We need a clear recognition of the inevitable correlation that exists between the habits, customs, institutions, viewpoints, and desires of the people and the land uses and economic practices which they follow. To assume that the alteration of the physical and economic basis will automatically result in a definite and predictable change in the psychological and sociological factors is unrealistic. To assume that a level of living or a culture which, by outside criteria, is below par is unquestioned proof of the existence of social maladjustment in an area is equally invalid.

We seem to have become highly aware of the physical and economic side of the equation in practical planning, but for the most part we have either disregarded the social side or assumed that it is made up of well-known, universally accepted facts which can be taken for granted in any and all situations. But human facts vary from area to area, and the details about them are less known than any other element in the situation. Realistic, practical planning requires that they be fully considered, understood, and interpreted.

The Land Utilization Program Begins Its Second Year

by C. F. CLAYTON

AS the land utilization program under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Act enters its second year of operation, it assumes both a broader scope of activity and a wider geographical range. Confined during last year largely to the Great Plains, new land utilization projects are now being established in each of the seven administrative regions. Moreover, the Bureau is now functioning in all phases of the land utilization program: from the planning of new projects, through the purchase and improvement of land, to the management of project areas.

Three Types of Projects

Important activities this year will continue to be directed at the completion of projects included in the "old" program, formerly under the Resettlement Administration. Major emphasis, however, is placed upon the development of new projects (including some expansion of old projects) in accordance with the policies laid down for the administration of title III. Three types of projects are being set up under this program:

Agricultural projects: Purchase and improvement of land which is submarginal in its present use as a means of developing an economically sound pattern of agricultural land use for a maximum number of families.

Isolated Settler projects: Purchase of scattered farms on submarginal land to permit the full dedication of a land area to some non-agricultural use, such as forestry, game conservation, recreation, or a combination of such uses.

Water Conservation projects: Purchase of land and construction of water developments, such as impounding dams, in areas where conservation and proper use of the water is of outstanding importance to desirable land use.

A Continuing Program

The adjustments contemplated by the land utilization program under title III cannot be effected in the course of a single year. Both land acquisition and the development of a new pattern of use demand a longer time. Consequently projects will be selected with a view to initiating a program of land purchase and of adjustments in the use

of land, to be carried out over a period of years. In the current fiscal year only such land will be acquired as can be purchased at a fair price and without the exercise of pressure on vendors who hesitate to sell as a means of advancing the program of purchase.

In order to facilitate the progress of purchases, a number of project areas may be established on which land acquisition will be started only if the purchase program on other projects does not advance rapidly enough to utilize the available funds. This procedure should enable the Bureau to give careful consideration to the types of adjustment appropriate to each area, and to allow sufficient time to work them out without retarding land acquisition.

In accordance with this policy, it is probable that 28 new projects will be set up by June 1938 in all regions but the Northern Great Plains, where available funds will be spent on projects initiated during the past fiscal year. The distribution of the probable new projects is as follows:

Region	Projects	Probable acreage to be acquired in new projects, 1938-39	Approximate cost of acreage
	Number	Acres	Dollars
I. Northern Great Plains Region	0	0	0
II. Southern Great Plains Region	6	161, 153	389, 165
III. North Central Region	4	26, 700	305, 840
IV. Northeastern Region	5	27, 700	305, 840
V. Southeastern Region	5	36, 300	305, 840
VI. South Central Region	4	39, 300	305, 840
VII. Pacific Coast Region	4	100, 000	305, 840
Total	28	391, 153	1, 918, 365

Land Acquisition Goal

Outside of the new projects listed above, land is now being acquired on 106 active projects. With every effort being placed behind the paramount task of getting the necessary acreage under option so that development and adjustments in use can follow, it is hoped that by June 30, 1939, approximately 2,286,000 acres will be contracted for. During the spring and early summer some reluctance to sell was encountered among land owners in the Great Plains, where unusually heavy spring rains had raised the hope of a return to former boom years. Drought in many Plains areas during succeeding months, however, has reawakened the desire of farm families to sell out and move to more favorable farm lands.

Development Features

The outstanding feature of the land development work on new projects during the present 12 months is the water conservation projects in the southwest. Seven such projects are now under way. Construction of large earth-fill dams on these projects will create extensive lakes in areas where no large bodies of water have heretofore existed. Popular interest in the recreational phases of these developments already has been large.

On other areas development activities will be directed primarily at restoring land to range use in the Great Plains Region, and to completing pasture improvement, forestry work, and recreational and wildlife developments on "old" projects. Naturally land development follows land acquisition, so that work under way this year will necessarily be confined largely to projects established prior to July 1.

Importance of Management Work

A growing field of work in connection with the land utilization projects—and one which in many ways is the most significant of all—is that concerned with working out management plans for the purchased areas and putting these plans into effect. Although many projects, particularly among those included in the "old" program, are being transferred to State or to other Federal agencies for administration, a large number will be managed by the Bureau. From the "old" program, 18 projects, comprising 3,928,612 acres, have been assigned to the Bureau for permanent administration.

In most cases the projects to be retained by the Bureau involve a close coordination of adjustments in the pattern of land use and in the organization of the farm or ranch unit. For example, the Great Plains projects, wherein the use of the purchased land is the keystone of the operations of local, private stock ranches. The objective in these pre-eminently agricultural projects, which will play an increasingly important part in the program, is to work out in the area as many sound operating units as possible, utilizing the publicly owned land as a backlog, to establish and maintain a stable economy for the area as a whole.

No plan for such a project is complete until a satisfactory plan of land use has been devised and the operating units have been adjusted as to number, size, distribution, and type of farming to fit the plan of use appropriate for the area; furthermore, no plan is satisfactory until it has been so proved in actual operation. As projects are being brought to the point of completion, making possible the launching of a better type of land use and operating unit, the acid test of the program really commences. The importance of this aspect of the work during the current year cannot be easily overestimated; its outcome will, in fact, provide an important index of the ultimate values of the program.

Farm Families in the Dust Bowl

by ROBERT T. MACMILLAN

THE principal factors militating against more rapid reorganization of the agricultural economy of the Southern High Plains have to do with the psychology and the resources of the farmers themselves. Sufficient fundamental knowledge of the human elements involved in land use is not available at this time to serve as a basis for a comprehensive planning program. The purpose of this paper is, therefore, to report some of the findings of recent sociological studies which should influence the formulation of land policies.

*Farm Migration*¹

Many of the present problems of the Dust Bowl can be traced directly to the recency of its settlement, to the unwise pattern in which that settlement grew. One-third of all farm families in Baca County, Colo., located near the Bowl's center, migrated to the county during the 10-year period beginning in 1927. These homeseekers, like their predecessors who came during the intermittent booms of 1885-88 and 1914-21, were eager to convert a semiarid plains country from a range to a cultivable agriculture. On 160- or 320-acre tracts patterned according to national homestead laws, they had no other recourse.

Migrants to Baca County

Migrants to the farm lands of Baca County during the last decade possess four definite characteristics: First, they moved from farm to farm twice as frequently as the farm families that were living in the county prior to 1926. Second, they constitute nearly two-thirds of all tenants in the county. Third, they gravitated mostly to small-size farms. Fourth, 60 percent of them operate crop-specialty farms, devoted principally to wheat.

Male heads of farm families which have moved to Baca County since 1926 are older and possess more farm experience than earlier settlers, which suggests that they may be slower to adopt any recommended changes in farming methods. Other data taken on all farm operators show that Baca County and its proximate territory act as absorption areas for surplus farm populations from Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma,

¹ Unless otherwise stated, data presented in this paper were obtained from land-use surveys and farm management—rural sociology surveys in Baca County, Colo., and Haskell and Seward Counties, Kans., conducted by the Farm Security Administration.

and Texas. Furthermore, judging by the per acre land value of land and buildings shown in the 1935 census, nearly one-half of the families had always lived in the poorest one-quarter of the counties in the State from which they moved to Baca County.

So much for migration to the Plains. The question now arises, what types of farm families have moved from the region during the protracted drought period? Competent observers believe that depopulation has drawn most heavily on the middle class of farm families. Those remaining in the region are largely families too poor or too inert to move or are earlier settlers who accumulated sufficient land and livestock to withstand in part the impact of intense drought. How long these bitter-enders can resist the adversities of drought and crop failure will depend not only upon their health and resources, but upon their ability to procure production loans or other forms of assistance.

Farm Tenure and Organization

The basic cause of agricultural distress in the plains is the uneconomic size of farm units. To this factor are closely associated increases in tenancy, land misuse resulting from the one-crop evil, and low standards of living. In Baca County, three-fourths of all tenanted farms and four-fifths of the farms of full owners contained one section (640 acres) or less. About three-fourths of the owners operating additional rented lands occupied units having more than one section. Yet farm management specialists advance the opinion based upon the analysis of several hundred individual farm records, that at least three sections are necessary to promote proper use of land.

In Baca County, tenancy increased from 3 percent in 1910 to 44 percent in 1935, according to the Farm Census. This is to be expected; a high rate of tenancy is almost a universal phenomenon in a speculative farming section, few farmers being financially able to assume all of the risks familiar to plains agriculture.

Certain other social and economic forces lie behind these increases in tenancy. Equities in land holdings are so small as to preclude any possibility of liquidation except through foreclosure. For instance, three-fourths of a selected sample of 132 owner-operated farms carried land indebtedness averaging 35 percent of the total value. Also, dependency on one-crop farming (40 percent of the farms are in this category) reduces the stability and certainty of farm income. This fluctuation of income necessitates the incurring of new debts, prevents the payment of principal and interest on old obligations, depletes or exhausts resources, and otherwise discourages the desire for ownership. Unfortunately, however, land speculation will undoubtedly continue to attract investors and will tend to maintain land values at a higher level than would be justified by long-term income possibilities.

Dependence on Government Aid

Tenants and owners are much more dependent on Government assistance than owners-additional. One-half of the cash receipts reported in 1936 by tenant families in Baca County came from payments under the agricultural adjustment and relief programs, while owners and owners-additional received, respectively, 40 and 30 percent of their cash incomes from Government sources. Payments under the adjustment program and relief were advanced to three-fourths of all operators studied in the county. Relief alone was granted to two-thirds of all tenants and about one-half of all owners. Livestock farmers required less assistance than crop-specialty or general farmers; small farm operators were heavy recipients of aid. It is significant that one-fifth of all farmers procured loans from Government agencies, subsidies, and relief. The question may well be raised whether these families could not be supported in some other occupation at less cost to society. For many of them are hardly qualified to pursue their trade.

In Baca County, where land values are the lowest for any Colorado county, it is estimated that about one-third of all farmers in 1936 were in an almost impossible position for successful commercial farming. This classification included operators over 65 years of age; operators 45 to 65 years of age reporting no livestock on farms; and operators obtaining Government assistance in the form of land and crop loans, adjustment and erosion-control payments, and relief. Small owner-operators and tenants were heavily represented in these classes. To the writer a situation of this kind signifies a problem of human obsolescence that demands careful attention in any land-use program.

Standards of Living

Farm-family surveys in scattered counties of the "dust bowl" reveal wide variations in the cost or value of family living. Two hundred families in two southwestern Kansas counties spent an average of \$800 in cash for living expenses in addition to an estimated average value of \$300 for products raised on the farm for home use. In Baca County, Colo., however, the total cost of living for 175 farm families averaged only \$725, of which one-fourth was for food, fuel, and housing provided by the farm. About three-fifths of these Colorado families reported less than \$500 cash living expenditures. In the southern part of the Plains, records of 80 families from Deaf Smith County, Tex., showed an average total living budget valued at \$1,150, 40 percent of which was home-produced. Here, except in extremely poor counties, farm families appeared to be living at fairly adequate levels of consumption. However, in all counties surveyed, approximately one-third to one-half of gross cash incomes were derived from Government payments.

Conclusion

Indirectly, the recency of settlement in the Southern High Plains should prove advantageous in hastening achievement of proper adjustments in land use, for social patterns involving the customs and traditions of these communities are still in the process of formation. But the foremost fact to keep in mind is that formal changes in land use which do not take into account the social needs of the population are of no particular avail as measures of long-time relief or reconstruction.



Bureau of Agricultural Economics Reorganizes Regions

TO achieve a more efficient basis of operation, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has consolidated its field organization in the land utilization program, eliminating four regional offices. This decision was made effective in a memorandum signed by Acting Secretary Brown in July.

The reorganized regions and their offices as now constituted comprise these States:

I. *Northern Great Plains Region (Lincoln, Nebr.)*: Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

II. *Southern Great Plains Region (Amarillo, Tex.)*: Western Texas, New Mexico, western Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado.

III. *North Central Region (Milwaukee, Wis.)*: Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

IV. *Northeastern Region (New Haven, Conn.)*: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia.

V. *Southeastern Region (Atlanta, Ga.)*: Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama.

VI. *South Central Region (Little Rock, Ark.)*: Eastern Oklahoma, eastern Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi.

VII. *Pacific Coast Region (Berkeley, Calif.)*: Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, Utah, Nevada, and Arizona.

In effecting these consolidations, regional offices have been closed at Raleigh, N. C.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Dallas, Tex.; and Portland, Oreg. The Denver office of the Northern Great Plains region has been transferred to Lincoln, Nebr.

Resettlement of Nonconforming Users

by GEORGE S. WEHRWEIN

IT has been remarked that "relocation without rural zoning is a job never done; rural zoning without relocation is a job half done; and rural zoning followed by relocation will make both a success." Few informed citizens of Wisconsin will question the preventive benefits afforded by rural zoning ordinances. But if those benefits are to be followed by more positive rewards to the State and the community, relocation must succeed and complement zoning.

Why is this necessary? Because the Wisconsin zoning enabling act specifically states that ordinances must not prohibit the continuance of the use established at the time the ordinance took effect. No established use can be forced out of a restricted district, nor can the usual public services be curtailed. This means that all the "high cost" settlers causing excessive public expenditures for schools and roads continue to demand these services just as if the county had not been zoned. That is why it is impossible to answer the question, "What have the counties saved by zoning?" Savings consist of preventing *future* settlers from locating in isolated places where their presence would create exorbitant costs for public services. How much future expense has been prevented is anybody's guess.

Savings Start With Relocation

But with the relocation of the nonconforming user, actual economies will be realized. For instance, after eliminating the settler at the end of a road 10 miles long, the road can be closed and the State aid of \$50 a mile will be saved. The settler's relocation may also mean savings in the cost of transporting the children to school, or, if enough settlers are moved out, entire schools may be closed, saving county and State aids as well as local taxes. Costs of health service, fire protection, county agent, and nursing work also will be curtailed by redistribution of population following zoning for agriculture, forestry, and recreation.

In one of the northern Wisconsin counties an area of 200,000 acres of land largely unsuited to agriculture has only 105 school children. Relocation of the families with children would save \$17,000 annually, and in about 3 years the savings would equal the value of the property owned or rented by the parents of these children.

How can relocation be assisted? The Settler Relocation Board bill, which was crowded out at the close of the last session of the Wisconsin Legislature, gave one answer. It set up a fund for the purchase of high

cost nonconforming users. To the extent savings were expected in State aids for schools and roads, the respective State departments were to pay aids thus saved for a given period into the Settler Relocation fund, thus making the savings pay the cost of removing the nonconforming user.



The isolated homestead of a Wisconsin man, forced to till unprofitable land when the sawmill at which he worked closed down.

Economy Is Only One Aim

However, the reasons for the relocation of nonconforming land users go beyond economies in public expenditures. Some of the settlers are now on submarginal land and on public relief of one kind or another. These men should be resettled on better soils or assisted to find other jobs for the sake of their own rehabilitation. Savings in public relief alone in many cases justify spending the taxpayers' money for this purpose. Zoning, then, can not only prevent repetition of the mistakes of the past by making it illegal to select farms in the 4,800,000 acres closed to agriculture, but it can also direct settlers to better lands. Zoning has not closed the entire north to future settlement; over 4,500,000 acres are still open to agricultural development in the unrestricted districts.

The costs of isolation from markets, schools, and community institutions, and its psychological and sociological consequences, which cannot be measured in money, are also important reasons for resettlement. The first effect of zoning is to "freeze" the population pattern by preventing neighbors from coming in to create communities. And, as time goes on, settlers leave. The result is that the public and private per capita costs of isolation are temporarily increased. To mitigate this situation, a comprehensive relocation program is necessary.

No Monopoly in Rural Zoning

It should also be pointed out that rural zoning is not like city zoning. In the city the nonconforming use store has a certain monopoly. With the exception of a few farmers, who may have a profitable business selling farm products to resorts and summer residents, the nonconforming farmer has no monopoly advantage; rather he is subjected to inconveniences and costs as described above.

Finally, all uses not in harmony with the established legal uses should be abated. Scattered farms in a forest zone are a constant fire menace, and isolation is an invitation to break the game laws. The administration of the forest and of the zoning ordinance itself is made easier in proportion to the diminution of the nonconforming uses.

While the complete abatement of all land uses not in harmony with the legal uses is desirable, it is not practicable to relocate *all* the settlers now listed as nonconforming users. In some cases it is even a choice between bringing in more settlers to make a real community in an area of good soil or relocating those now in the underpopulated area. Others live on the edge of the district and cause no more expense for public services than their neighbors across the boundary of the district. Other things being equal, wherever a settler is located on good land the cost of relocation might well be balanced against the savings in the cost of public services before a final answer is given.



Contributors to This Issue

F. R. KENNEY is in charge of water utilization planning in the B. A. E. land utilization program. . . . CARL C. TAYLOR heads the farm population and rural life work of the B. A. E. . . . C. F. CLAYTON directs project organization for the land utilization program. . . . ROBERT T. MACMILLAN is associated with Oklahoma A. & M. College and formerly was with the Farm Security Administration. . . . GEORGE S. WEHRWEIN, professor of agricultural economics in the University of Wisconsin, is a nationally known authority on zoning and land use problems generally. . . . REX E. WILLARD is regional director for the Northern Great Plains in the land utilization program, B. A. E.

Land Use Adjustment—The Basis of Rehabilitation

As Illustrated by the Spring Creek Area, Wyoming

by REX E. WILLARD

TO make a complete shift from an undesirable pattern of land use, with its poverty, its ruination of the land, and its heavy costs for relief and public services, to a utilization of land as a sound economic basis for successful agriculture takes time. For four years projects have been under way in the Northern Great Plains to do just that thing—and now for the first time we can point to completed jobs. Adjustments effected in the Spring Creek area, Campbell County, Wyoming, form one of the best illustrations of this work.

Whereas four years ago a large part of the land was devoted to unsuccessful grain farming, for which the soil and climate were unsuited, now the area is being utilized for feed production and range—uses for which Nature has adapted it. Whereas formerly most of the operators occupied tracts too small for stock ranching and therefore were forced to overgraze the range, now all operators have been given an opportunity to obtain use of sufficient range land for a type of stock farming to which the land is suited. Those former operators who have moved away have been enabled to find satisfactory farms or jobs elsewhere.

Spring Creek area is part of the northeastern Wyoming project which was started under the land utilization program in 1934. The four townships—approximately 100,000 acres—within its boundaries present a rolling topography, a dry climate, few sources of water, and soils for the most part classed as unfit for cultivation—features that have been reported time and time again to describe millions of acres of Plains land where small farmers have suffered almost intolerable hardships from years of recurrent drought.

The Failure of Small Farms

Into this area, about 1919, came homesteaders under a system of land settlement and use that took no cognizance of the character of the land. The range—until that time used by a relatively few livestock operators—was broken up into small ranches and homesteads of 320 and 640 acres. Grass was turned under and wheat and other cash crops were planted. Nature smiled upon the settler and the speculator for

a few years, when adequate rainfall coincided with high wheat prices. But the smile was soon changed to a burning glare. In the 20 years since the first settlement of this area, only 9 have been good for crops. In 1923 and 1924, and from 1928 on, crops failed. From the fact that most of the land is classed as grazing land, it was to be expected that some farmers would fail consistently in attempts to raise wheat. The fact that the 12-year average yearly rainfall, as reported by six weather bureau stations in or near the area, was only 14.25 inches explains further why crop failures were at times general.

By the time the land utilization project was started, considerable "adjustments" of a sort had already been taking place. Farms had been abandoned on a large scale. Some operators attempted to block together larger stock units by lease; the few who succeeded found the range badly depleted by overgrazing and cultivation, while the lack of sufficient stock water constituted another serious handicap.

Extensive demands for emergency loans and relief expressed the condition of other operators who elected to stay on the land. Tax delinquency was growing, and the land itself was steadily deteriorating from erosion of the soil and overgrazing of the grass.

Toward Sound Operating Units

In initiating the land use adjustment project in 1934, the objective was to establish a pattern of land use that would permit all operators who remained in the area to obtain sufficient land to operate an economically sound unit, and operate it in such a way as to protect the soil and grass from wasteful abuse.

As in most Great Plains project areas, the key to this necessary change was the pattern of land ownership. Investigation proved that the land in this 100,000-acre area was divided into 120 different private ownerships; Federal and State Governments combined held title to 8 percent of the land. The private ownerships varied from 40 to 5,520 acres and averaged only 747 acres. Local operators were rarely able to build up their units to an economically desirable size, even if they possessed the money with which to purchase or lease the necessary land; obscure titles and the intermingling of tracts of different ownership were among the important factors that made this difficult.

Automatic Adjustment Doesn't Work Out

It was natural, therefore, that despite considerable abandonment of homestead land, consolidation of tracts through lease had not progressed far. The area continued to be overpopulated for agricultural uses, and operating units in the area were for the most part too small. If farmers were to carry out livestock enterprises, more range was needed; otherwise they would be required to continue destructive and unstable cash-crop cultivation.

Such waterholes as this in the Northern Great Plains increase range capacity, protect against overgrazing, and make possible better range management.



In 1934, before the project was initiated, there were 54 operating units in the area, averaging 1,700 acres. Thirty-five of the 54 units contained less than 2,000 acres. Moreover, the pattern of use for the Spring Creek area was highly unstable; units consisted of widely separated tracts of land; much of the land was held under annual lease, providing a poor basis for permanent development and conservation; additional tracts of land were abandoned and subject to no control whatever, being open to competitive grazing of a highly destructive sort that spelled decreasing value of the range.

The program started in 1934 was threefold. First, land was purchased in order to clarify the complicated pattern of control. Out of the 100,000 acres in the area it was found necessary to acquire about 41,000 acres in order to work out the necessary adjustments. Second, new and economically sound operating units were established on both public and private land, and a plan of use for the entire area developed. Finally, the range was developed to restore the valuable grasses and increase the water supplies necessary for efficient grazing of the entire area.

100,000 Acres Under Controlled Management

As part of the program for land management, a cooperative grazing association was formed including all the operators remaining in the area. This association leases from the Government all public domain and purchased land; it leases as well all privately owned lands that are not directly under the control of a member of the association. Thus the association is in a position to manage the use of the entire 100,000

acres for the best interest of the local operators. The interest of the public, as represented by the Government-owned land, is protected by provisions in the lease whereby the grazing association agrees to practice conservation of the natural resources and operate the area in accordance with the best range practices.

The present picture of operations in the Spring Creek area, although it still offers opportunity for further improvement, shows what can be done. There are now 22 operators in the area who are members of the grazing association, who have the use of an average of approximately 4,760 acres each. (There are in addition three operators remaining in the area who refused to participate in the program and are, therefore, still on farms of small size.) Each operator, therefore, has access to enough land to permit him to shift from crop farming to stock ranching. The fact that he now has a unit that is economically sound, makes it possible for him to obtain commercial credit or rehabilitation loans with which to build up his herd and make needed improvements on his ranch headquarters. Leases have been extended to longer terms for much of the land, so that a permanent plan of sound management becomes practicable. The water facilities developed on the public lands contribute also to the better use of the land, decreasing the possibility of overgrazing and consequent depletion of the grass and soil.

Helping to Balance the Public Ledgers

In the course of the development of the area, it should be pointed out, jobs offered through the Works Progress Administration were the sole means of support for many families in the area. Moreover, using largely salvaged material from abandoned farmsteads, a small public recreation area was developed in the southwestern part of the area, contributing to the social welfare of the local population. Further indirect benefits have accrued from the closing of two of the three schools in the area because of the relocation of several families. This will discontinue the need for approximately \$1,800 yearly, formerly required for the upkeep of the schools. Since half of this amount was raised by local school district taxes, the savings make possible a decrease in local tax rates.

Before the land use adjustments, 54 operators were living in the Spring Creek area. Afterward, only 25 remained. What of those who left?

In the purchase program, 27 occupied units were acquired by the Bureau. These farmsteads have been torn down or put to other use; the fields restored to grass. Inquiries were made a few months ago about people who moved out of these homes; information was obtained for all but four of them. For the most part they have taken their purchase money and found other farms in better areas.

Five former operators in this area are living on farms in eastern Wyoming; eight are farming in other States. Three men have gone into nonagricultural occupations—one of them has returned to his former position as a railroad conductor. Three men are now working as hired hands on the rehabilitated ranches in the area; two elderly couples have retired to live with relatives. One native-born German has used his purchase money to return to Europe. One individual died shortly after selling his farm.

Aside from some rehabilitation loans and advice when requested, no special aid was given to these families in finding new locations. Their success in reestablishing themselves testified to their ability and good sense, and adds further weight to the conclusion that their failure to make a living in the Spring Creek area was due, not to personal shortcomings, but to the application of a system of land use that was out of keeping with natural conditions. Correction of that pattern has made it possible for some families to shift to better farms, and has in turn opened the door to success for those that remain.



Land Use and Southern Needs

PROBLEMS of land use occupy a large part of the National Emergency Council's report to President Roosevelt on economic conditions of the South. In his letter asking such a report, the President called attention to the "wasted or neglected resources of land and water, the abuses suffered by the soil," and to the "problem of farm ownership, of which farm tenantry is a part."

The section of the report devoted to ownership and use of land emphasizes that "6 acres of southern crop land out of every 10 are planted one season after another in cotton, tobacco, and corn," although "fields planted to them year after year wear out and wash away much more quickly than fields on which legumes are planted in rotation with cash crops."

Asserting that "no other similar area in the world gambles its welfare . . . on a single crop market," the section says the gamble "is not a good one," cites quick price changes of cotton, and emphasizes the hazards to which the cotton economy subjects grower, merchant, planter, and banker alike.

The rise of tenancy, the report traces to the Civil War, adding: "Over wide areas of the South cash cropping, one-crop farming, and tenant farming have come to mean practically the same thing. Diversification has been difficult . . . Tenant families form the most unstable part of our population . . . The tenant has no incentive to protect the soil, plant cover crops, or keep buildings in repair."

The section devoted to soil, after emphasizing the wasteful erosion that has followed poor farming methods, declares: "Southeastern farms are the smallest in the Nation. The operating units average only 71 acres, and nearly one-fourth of them are smaller than 20 acres. A farmer with so little land is forced to plant every foot of it in cash crops; he cannot spare an acre for soil-restoring crops or pasture." This section also points to the need for forests and grass both to halt erosion and to minimize floods.—R. S.



Books

THE MASTER PLAN. *Edward M. Bassett. Russell Sage Foundation. New York City, 1938.*

Those working in the field of planning are well acquainted with Mr. Bassett's writings on zoning. In this volume he has endeavored to set forth what he considers to be the proper scope of the master plan. The book is divided into two parts: In part I, Mr. Bassett maintains that the elements of "a plan" for any type of community, city, town, village, county, State, or Nation are the same; i. e., streets, parks, sites for public buildings, public reservations, zoning districts, routes for public utilities, and pierhead and bulkhead lines. He believes no other elements should be included, and does not try to separate planning into fields of city, regional, county, State, or national planning, as he feels all planning is community land planning. Part II of the book is taken up with illustrative discussions of planning in New York City, Cincinnati, Ohio, second class cities and counties in Pennsylvania, towns, villages, and counties in New York State, California, New Jersey, and Massachusetts.

Mr. Bassett feels that the master plan is "rapidly becoming an important feature of planning, whether local, state, or national," and that there is considerable confusion both in the use of the term and in understanding its proper scope. The desirability of having the master plan remain in the custody of the Planning Commission in a plastic form, rather than to be ossified by legislative enactment, is stressed. "Enthusiastic legislators and drafters of bills seem to think that it is a short way to legislate and forget that it is for the use of commissions which are advisory bodies only." He feels a sharp distinction should exist between the master plan and official maps as adopted by legislative bodies.

In discussing what constitutes community land planning, the author says: "Each of the elements of the plan set forth in this book relates to land areas; has been stamped on land areas by the community for community uses; can be shown on a map. If a subject does not conform to these three requirements, it does not come under the head of community land planning." Community land planning is considered, in brief, as the designation of the boundaries on a map of community land uses. "Walks and drives in a public park are not part of a plan. . . . Budgeting and fixing the time for beginning various improvements are said by some to be part of a plan. We doubt this. The makers of a coordinated plan should know all about the budgets, taxation, assessments for benefit, engineering, architecture, and landscape architecture. It is knowledge of these subjects that make a qualified planner. They may be called ancillary. They are not the elements of a plan."

Under the heading of "Application of Tried Methods of Regulation to New Problems," there is a brief discussion of the use of rural zoning to bring about reforestation and flood control and to prevent soil erosion and new farm development in submarginal areas. There is little in the book that will be helpful to those interested primarily in rural planning as related to agriculture, forestry, recreation, and other land uses. The book is essentially directed to those concerned with urban and suburban planning. Most planners will very likely feel that its approach is not sufficiently pragmatic, that it hedges the nature and scope of planning with too many technical restrictions—especially in the light of its plea for flexibility—and that the author fails to give adequate consideration to coordinating the many phases of land planning.—V. WEBSTER JOHNSON.





Here and there

★ Purely personal on planners: Virgil Simmons, of the Indiana Department of Conservation, is the new chairman of that State's planning board. . . . Prof. O. B. Jesness, of the University of Minnesota, has been appointed chairman of the Minnesota planning board. . . . C. R. Bitting now heads the Rhode Island State Planning Board. . . . His home is at Watch Hill. . . . Up in Alaska I. P. Taylor has been elected chairman of the territorial planning council, and J. E. Pegues has been appointed executive secretary. . . . Mr. Taylor succeeds Frank Heintzleman, who resigned. . . . And out in Hawaii Charles D. Rosenkrans has been made chairman of the territorial planning board, and J. H. Kunesh director. . . . Kunesh is now engaged in preparing an outline of procedure for the board to follow in compiling its major long-range public improvement program to be presented to the next session of the legislature.

★ Crop diversification vs. unemployment now draws Cuba's attention, the National Association of Cuban Landowners having adopted a plan whereby part of each sugar plantation will be devoted to crops other than sugar, and landowners will lend ox teams, plows, and other equipment to laborers on their plantations. . . . The government will furnish seed, the need for which is to be determined by local committees. . . . This year 75,000 acres have been planted to rice, peanuts, and corn, and 30,000 persons will get jobs in soil preparation, cultivation, and harvesting, the American Consulate General in Havana reports.

★ Forest-fire prevention, like forest fires themselves, has crossed international boundaries, in the three-way cooperative effort of the Province of Quebec, Canada, and the State of Maine. . . . Fire wardens of Quebec and the Maine Commissioner and his deputies have held conferences on forest fire problems since 1931, and since 1916 look-outs on both sides of the international line have been connected by telephone.

★ A Massachusetts State College experiment station survey has shown that cows get three times as much feed from treated pastures as from untreated, the press reports. . . . Study of the records of 111 Massachusetts farms showed that a 200 percent increase in grass followed use of seed, fertilizer, and lime on old pastures.

★ Ten steps to "reconstruct" Austrian agriculture given effect by Reich Minister of Agriculture Darri are reported by the American vice consul in Berlin as follows: price reductions for artificial fertilizer; credits for purchase of fertilizer; credits for construction of feed silos; flax and hemp subsidies; aid to the dairy industry; farm housing and equipment credits; aid to purchasers of farms; irrigation credits; relief for debtors; promotion of sales of Austrian agricultural products. . . . Funds for aid to Austrian agriculture, chiefly subsidies, are 54.7 million shillings, the vice consul says. . . . Save for higher subsidy rates, the Austrian measures correspond to those taken for agriculture in the German "4-year plan."

★ A petition is now before the Iowa State Planning Board asking the board and Governor Nels Kraschel to seek Federal help for encouragement of small subsistence farms in Appanoose County, through low-interest loans, an editorial in the Daily Iowegian reports. . . . The editorial says a critical stage in the Chariton River basin demonstration area program has been reached. . . . The program is up against the problem of making numerous families in the county self-supporting, hence the attempt to give relief families self-sufficiency. . . . The editorial says, however, that cooperation of people directly interested has made it relatively easy to work out lime projects, to establish health units, and to get soil erosion control under way.

★ Immediate colonization of sparsely settled areas is emphasized as a great national question of Finland in a decree of that country's President describing functions of the new Colonization Administration, the American Legation at Helsinki says. . . . Northern, eastern, and interior sections of Finland are not populous, the 3,600,000 persons in the country being concentrated in the southern and western coastal areas. The new administration is to facilitate settlement of other areas, particularly along the eastern frontier.

★ Planning principles, technique, and administration were included in a course offered for the first time this summer at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, sponsored by the institute's school of architecture and the American Planning and Civic Association. . . . Open to men and women, the course was designed for these groups: men now on the staffs of Federal, State, and local planning agencies whose technical training is incomplete; present or prospective students of planning wishing to advance their technical competence; members of local planning boards who desire additional knowledge; teachers of civics and related subjects who wish added teaching background and seek information that will help them to encourage planning in their own communities.

{✓ *For your attention*

- ✓ **FINANCING AGRICULTURE.** *L. J. Norton. The Interstate Publishers. Danville, Ill. 1938.*

The author, professor of agricultural economics of the University of Illinois, is concerned with such practical farm problems as those of credit and cooperative organization, but places his main emphasis upon factors to be considered both by the maker and receiver of agricultural loans. His discussion of conditions that justify long-term risks, and those that do not, is of especial interest.

- ✓ **THE LAND USE PROGRAM IN ACTION.** *C. F. Clayton. Agricultural Situation. 22 (5) 9 B. A. E., U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. May 1938.*

Federal land purchase, the author says in this first of a series on the land use program in action, is needed to bring about improvements in land use, but must be supplemented by organized local action if best results are to be obtained. Such local action has taken the form, in some parts of the Northern Great Plains, of cooperative grazing associations, making possible application of constructive land management over a greater area than could be acquired with Federal funds.

- ✓ **CLIMBING THE AGRICULTURAL LADDER.** *C. O. Dickey. Southern Agriculturist. LXVIII (8) 6. Nashville, Tenn. August 1938.*

Sketching the progress of tenant security farm projects in Tennessee, Mr. Dickey gives briefly the principal developments—selection of purchasers, acquisition of farms, advice and assistance, repair and construction of buildings, demonstration of results—and shows the steps in the life of a typical project.

- ✓ **IS THERE A WAY OUT OF THE LANDLORD-TENANT PROBLEM IN ARKANSAS?** *C. C. Randall. Extension Service Review 9 (7) 98. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. July 1938.*

Redistribution of population and "reconstruction of the farming system" is the fundamental need of the South, says this author, who contends that present attempts to deal with tenantry problems miss the fundamental problem that lies in "trying to make one acre do the work of three." Pointing out 12 Southern States have a farm income less than half that of the other 36 States yet have a farm population more than two million more than the other States, Mr. Randall proposes Southern farmers use more land and make grass, livestock, and timber work for them.

- ✓ **RURAL POVERTY.** *Division of Research, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C. February 1938.*

Causes, extent and concentration of rural poverty are shown in maps and charts in this publication. Topics treated include: rural relief and resettlement, crop failure and drought areas, farm prices and credit, farm tenancy and farm labor, farm income and plane of living, and rural population growth and migration.

✓ **AGRICULTURAL FINANCE REVIEW. VOL. 1. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington, D. C. May 1938.**

With this issue the Bureau of Agricultural Economics seeks to meet the need for a periodic review of agricultural finance. It will appear in May and November. Contents of the first issue include: Farm-Mortgage Indebtedness Shows Further Decline—D. C. Horton and E. J. Engquist; Agricultural Loans of Commercial Banks Continue to Increase—N. J. Wall; Farmers Mutual Fire Insurance: New Developments—V. N. Valgren; Crop Insurance for Wheat—W. H. Rowe; Merchant Credit Problems Involved in Specialized Crop Production—B. D. Seeley; Research in County Banks—F. L. Garlock; The Farmers' Present Tax Situation—D. Jackson; Trends of Farm Mortgage Interest Rates—E. J. Engquist and N. A. Back.

✓ **FARM TENANCY. An editorial and two articles. Wallace's Farmer. Des Moines. July 16, 1938.**

Urging "united farm effort, by all groups, to cash in on" recommendations of the Iowa Tenancy Committee, this publication prints an editorial and two articles devoted to the committee's work and to progress of tenants aided under the Bankhead-Jones Act. The committee's recommendations, formulated after probably the most exhaustive canvass of farmer opinion ever made on the subject, included: 6 months' notice for termination of lease; compensation to tenant for unexhausted improvements and compensation to landlord for damage; compulsory arbitration of landlord-tenant disputes; landlord's lien to be limited to half the value of the produce of the farm in the current year.

✓ **FAMILY SELECTION ON A FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT. Marie Jasny. Social Research Report No. V. Bureau of Agricultural Economics and Farm Security Administration, Washington, D. C. June 1938.**

This information was gathered by the author in a field study of the Tule Lake division of the Klamath Irrigation Project, Oregon-California. Settlers entered upon this project almost a decade ago. Their experiences appear to verify that of settlers in other planned communities. Some failed, some succeeded beyond expectations.

✓ **REGIONAL PLANNING. PART V—RED RIVER OF THE NORTH. National Resources Committee, Washington, D. C. Superintendent of Documents, 25 cents. August 1937.**

This study was primarily an interstate enterprise, resulting in the first published comprehensive water program for any large drainage basin in the United States. The plan embraces utilization of the basin's water both to minimize drought and avert flood. Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota have adopted an interstate compact to carry out a project program making effective a water plan for the basin.

✓ **AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS IN GRAINGER COUNTY, TENNESSEE. R. M. Glendinning and E. N. Torbert. Economic Geography. Worcester, Mass. April 1938.**

The fundamental problem of this county, the authors assert, is that there are too many families in the county for the land to support. Larger farms are needed but the resources of the land cannot provide sites for them. The article is based upon a 1936 report by the same authors on file in the TVA division of land planning and housing.

LAND POLICY REVIEW

Contents FOR SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER 1938

	Page
Water for the West..... <i>F. R. Kenney</i>	1
The Human Aspects of Land-use Planning... <i>Carl C. Taylor</i>	6
The Land-utilization Program Begins Its Second Year <i>C. F. Clayton</i>	11
Farm Families in the Dust Bowl..... <i>Robert T. MacMillan</i>	14
Resettlement of Nonconforming Users. <i>George S. Wehrwein</i>	18
Land-use Adjustment—The Basis of Rehabilitation <i>Rex E. Willard</i>	21
Books.....	26
Here and There.....	28
For Your Attention.....	30

The Land Policy Review is published bimonthly by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Subscriptions for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
5c single copy, 25 cents per year

